DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 026 989 JC 690 022

Follow-Up Studies of Bronx Community College Graduates.
City Univ. of New York, N.Y. Bronx Community Coll.
Report No-BCC-RR-2-69
Pub Date Jan 69
Note-20p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.10
Descriptors-*Followup Studies, *Junior Colleges, *Transfer Students
Identifiers-*New York

This study compares two groups--Bronx Community College graduates who went, as juniors, to City College of New York and to Hunter (Bronx) in September 1965 and 60 native juniors at the same two upper-division colleges. At CCNY there was a slight difference in graduation rate between transfers and natives; at Hunter (Bronx), there was none. Of the transfers, 72% lost no credits; 21% lost up to four credits; only three students lost 10 or more credits. The comparison of academic performance takes into account initial differences in academic readiness between the natives and the transfers on entry into their respective freshman classes. (The native students were a random sample of those who had had a high school average below 85%, to make them comparable to the transfer group.) On entry into the junior year, relative progress seems somewhat better for the natives than for the transfers; this, however, should be interpreted cautiously, as several dissimilarities were not taken into account. The analysis suggests that students entering Bronx Community College with the same high school average as those entering CCNY as freshmen can be expected to earn about the same final 2-year indices as the native CCNY students. This expectation is even clearer in the case of the Hunter (Bronx) students. (HH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Research Report

BRONX COMMUNITY COLLEGE
of THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Office of Institutional Research

BCC 2-69

FOLLOW-UP STUDIES OF BRONX COMMUNITY COLLEGE GRADUATES

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

FEB 20 1968

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

January 1969

RESEARCH GROUP

Dr. Norman Eagle, Coordinator

Dr. Morton Rosenstock
Associate Dean of Faculty

Prof. John E. D'Andrea
Registrar and Admissions Officer

Prof. Carl Saueracker
Assistant Dean of Student Personnel

Mr. Meyer Shopkow
Director, Data Processing Center

JC 690 022

- - ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS - -

The Bronx Community College Research Group was most fortunate in having the full cooperation of Prof. Murray Lohman, of the Office of Research and Evaluation at the Board of Higher Education, during the course of this study. Prof.Lohman made available to us all the data he laboriously gathered for a comprehensive city-wide study of almost identical purpose to our own. Mrs. Muriel Davison, Occupational Analyst at the Board of Higher Education, also made available the results of a follow-up study of career students conducted by her office.

However, responsibility for all analyses, interpretations, and conclusions, and for the conception and execution of the analysis of covariance, rests with the Research Group at the College.

- - - - - - - - - - - - -

FOLLOW-UP STUDIES OF BRONX COMMUNITY COLLEGE GRADUATES

I. Transfer Students

A Board of Higher Education study, not yet released, has traced the history of community college students entering the junior class of the various four-year city colleges in September 1965. These transfer students had entered city community colleges two years before in September 1963. Since C.C.N.Y. and Hunter (Bronx) receive a great preponderance of the Bronx Community College graduates, only data for these two colleges are reported here. Table I reveals the "fate" of 74 Bronx Community College graduates entering C.C.N.Y. and Hunter (Bronx) in September 1965 compared with 60 "native" C.C.N.Y. and Hunter (Bronx) students who entered in September 1963, and who achieved junior status by September 1965. All of these "native" students entered with high school averages below 85%. There were 25 other students who entered C.C.N.Y. and Hunter (Bronx) in September 1963 with high school averages below 85%, but these are excluded from the table since they did not achieve junior class status by September 1965. Hence, the groups being compared are 74 students who spent two years at Bronx Community College and who attained junior class status by September 1965, and a group of 60 students who started their college careers at C.C.N.Y. or Hunter (Bronx) in September 1963. The differences between the two groups as entering freshmen, in terms of the distribution of high school average scores or C.U.N.Y. composite score, is not reported in the C.U.N.Y. study. (However, this college entrance data has been collected by the Bronx Community College Research Group and will be reported later in connection with a supplementary study of B.C.C. student success at four-year city colleges.)

(continued)

TABLE I

History of Bronx Transfer, and "Native" Students Who Entered Junior Year at C.C.N.Y. and Hunter (Bronx) in September 1965

Graduated, Continued Enrollment, or Left College	C.C.N.Y.		Hunter (Bronx)	
	B.C.C. Transfer	Native	B.C.C. Transfer	Native
Graduated February '67	-	-	-	1 (4%)
Graduated June '67	20 (43%)	13 (41%)	21 (78%)	23 (82%)
Graduated September '67	3 (6%)	3 (9%)	1 (4%)	-
Graduated February '68	6 (12%)	5 (16%)	3 (12%)	2 (7%)
Graduated June '68	6 (12%)	4 (13%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)
Graduated September '68	-	2 (6%)	-	-
In Attendance 9/68	2 (4%)	-	-	-
Transferred or Dropped Out	10 (21%)	5 (16%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)
Total	47	32	27	28

Examination of Table I reveals only very slight differences in graduation rates between Bronx Community College transfer and "native" students. At C.C.N.Y., 79% of the "native" students had graduated in a period up to one year after the expected graduation date (June 1968), compared to 73% of the B.C.C. transfer students. 16% of the"native" students had transferred or dropped out compared to 21% of the B.C.C. students.

At Hunter (Bronx), the graduation rate of the transfer students is exactly that of the "native" students for the same time period (1 year after the expected graduation date).

One other observation which may be made regarding these data is the fact that the graduation rate is substantially higher for Hunter (Bronx) for both transfer and "native" students, compared with C.C.N.Y. Five times as many transfer students,

(continued)

and four times as many "native students(in terms of percent), transfer or withdraw from C.C.N.Y. as from Hunter (Bronx). (Of course, it must be remembered that these graduation and withdrawal rates apply to a specific part of the four-year college "native" population, and cannot be generalized to the remaining part of the student population.)

Table II gives graduation and "drop-out" rates from all the four-year city colleges taken together, for students from four community colleges. The population in this case is all transferees from the community colleges in September 1965, regardless of credit status, program load, etc. Graduation rate is based on June 1967 data. Contrasting figures for a "control" group of "native" students are not reported.

TABLE II

Graduation and Drop-Out Rates of Graduates of Four Community Colleges, From All N.Y.C. 4-Year Colleges After 2 Years of Enrollment.

College	N	% Graduating June 1967	% Drop-Out by June 1967
Bronx C.C.	(144)	54.0	14.6
Queensborough C.C.	(70)	47.8	11.6
Staten Island C.C.	(66)	44.4	11.1
New York City C.C.*	(17)	13.3	6.7

* Note very low N (New York City C.C. also emphasizes career programs over transfer programs.)

Table II shows that the Bronx Community College is not in an unfavorable position relative to the other community colleges shown in the proportion of alumni graduating from a four-year city college in the expected two-year period after transfer.

By inference, it is apparent that a large proportion of transfer students continue to enroll beyond their expected graduation date (Bronx C.C. 31.4%, Q.C.C. 40.6%, S.I.C.C. 44.5%

(continued)

Credits Lost by Transfer Students

In transferring to four-year city colleges some students do not receive full credit for work performed at the city community colleges, although 66% of the group transferring in September 1965 lost no credit and an additional 20% lost three credits or less.

Table III gives the frequency distribution of credit hours lost by students from five city community colleges upon transfer to five city four-year colleges, after two years at their respective community colleges.

(continued)

TABLE III

Credit Lost by Transfer Students on Admission to Four-Year City Colleges, September 1965

Students Who Transferred		Frequency Distribution of Credit Hours Lost by Transferees														Total # of Students	Total # Credit Hours Lost	Mean Loss per Student
To:	From:	0	½	1	2	3	3½	4	4½	5	6	7	8	9	10+			
Brooklyn	Bronx C.C.	2	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	3	0.75
	Kingsb.C.C.	4	-	1	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	19	1.7
	N.Y.C.C.C.	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	4	10	101½	10.2
	Queensb.C.C.	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	0	0.0
	S.I.C.C.	5	-	15	-	25	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	35	60	1.7
C.C.N.Y.	Bronx C.C.	64	2	6	-	5	1	6	1	-	1	1	-	-	3	90	134	1.5
	Kingsb.C.C.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	N.Y.C.C.C.	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	8	4.0
	Queensb.C.C.	8	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	13	99	7.6
	S.I.C.C.	13	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	16	16	1.0
Hunter Bronx Campus	Bronx C.C.	30	-	-	-	1	-	4	-	-	-	3	1	-	-	39	48	1.2
	Kingsb.C.C.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	N.Y.C.C.C.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	9	9.0
	Queensb.C.C.	3	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	6	15	2.5
	S.I.C.C.	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	5	11½	2.3
Hunter Park Avenue Campus	Bronx C.C.	4	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	4	0.8
	Kingsb.C.C.	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3	3.0
	N.Y.C.C.C.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Queensb.C.C.	5	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	3	0.5
	S.I.C.C.	4	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	8	19	2.4
Queens	Bronx C.C.	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	4	2.0
	Kingsb.C.C.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	N.Y.C.C.C.	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	5	54½	10.9
	Queensb.C.C.	42	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	42	0	0.0
	S.I.C.C.	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	0.0

(continued)

Since some of the percentages in Table III are based on small numbers of students and may be "atypical," the table has been condensed and is represented by Table IV, which gives the mean credit loss per student for five city community colleges, across five four-year city colleges.

TABLE IV

Mean Credit Loss for Students Transferring From Five City Community Colleges to Five Four-Year City Colleges (September 1965)

Community College	Student N	Credit Loss N	Mean Credit Loss
Bronx C.C.	140	193	1.4
Kingsboro C.C.	12	22	1.8
New York City C.C.	18	173	9.6
Queensboro C.C.	70	117	1.7
Staten Island C.C.	45	106.5	1.6

It can be seen that the mean credit loss per Bronx Community College student of 1.4 credits was the lowest for any of the five community colleges involved in the study. The tables show that out of 140 students transferring from Bronx Community College, 101, or 72% lost no credit on matriculating in a four-year city college. Another 29, or 21%, lost up to four credits (equivalent to about one full semester's course). Only three students lost 10 or more credits. A detailed analysis of the reasons for credit loss on the part of 52 of the Bronx Community College transfer students is given in Appendix A. (There is a discrepancy here in the numbers of Bronx Community College students losing credit on transfer in September 1965. According to Table III, only 39 Bronx Community College students are shown as having lost credit. Yet, Appendix A

(continued)

gives details of credit loss for 32 Bronx Community College students. There are also other inconsistencies between Table III and Appendix A. The person at the Bureau of Higher Education who compiled the statistical data had left the bureau and was not available to clarify some of these inconsistencies.)

Academic Performance of Transfer Students

A study is currently in progress at Bronx Community College to appraise the academic performance of its transfer students at two of the city's four-year colleges which enroll a preponderance of the students transferring from Bronx Community College. This study will take into account initial differences in academic "readiness" between Bronx Community College transfer students and "native" four-year college students at the time of entry into their respective freshman classes.*

At this time, only a comparison of mean scholastic indices, uncorrected for initial (entering freshman) differences, is shown in Table V. A complete analysis of covariance will be reported later.

TABLE V

Mean Scholastic Indices for Bronx Community College Transfer Students and a "Native" Comparison Group at C.C.N.Y. and Hunter (Bronx)

College	N	Mean Scholastic Index After Sophomore Year	Mean Scholastic Index After Senior Year
Bronx C.C. Transfers to C.C.N.Y.	79	2.49	2.34
C.C.N.Y. "Natives"	32	2.31	2.31
Bronx C.C. Transfers to Hunter (Bronx)	37	2.60	2.35
Hunter (Bronx) "Natives"	41	2.22	2.64

* This study has now been completed and is reported on pp. 13-16.

(continued)

All students involved in the study entered their respective freshman classes in September 1963, their junior classes in September 1965, and completed four full semesters by June 1967. The comparison groups of "native" students were drawn by random sampling from all students admitted to the four-year college with a high school average below 85% (to make this group somewhat more comparable to the transfer group). Although curriculum was not controlled, informal observation suggests that practically all of the students involved in the study were matriculated in the liberal arts program at C.C.N.Y. and Hunter (Bronx). That the random sampling procedure did not, however, equate groups on some other important variables, is shown by the fact that both "native" comparison groups are overwhelmingly male, in contrast to a more balanced sex distribution in the transfer groups.

Bearing in mind these significant reservations, and the fact that Table V reports means which are uncorrected for initial differences in high school average, it is seen that at C.C.N.Y. the "native" group earned a scholastic index of about 0.2 (rounded) of a point higher than the Bronx Community College transfer group, while at Hunter (Bronx) no discernible difference is seen. However, on entry into the junior year, the transfer group showed noticeably higher indices at both colleges than the "native" comparison groups. At both colleges, therefore, <u>relative</u> progress seems to be somewhat better for the "native" groups in contrast to the transfer groups, though this must be interpreted with great caution since, as has been pointed out, the groups are not similar in several important ways. In addition, there is no way of estimating the comparability of transfer student and "native" student indices at the end of the sophomore year, since different colleges are involved. The above reference to relative progress, therefore, may actually hide starting points different from what is reflected by the end of the sophomore year indices shown in Table V.

Although the statistical significance of the final indices shown in Table V will not be known until completion of the analysis of covariance now in progress*, one may conclude that, at least for the groups used in the present study, there is no difference in final index between the Bronx Community College and Hunter (Bronx) groups, and only a very small difference in favor of the"native" group at C.C.N.Y. When initial differences in high school average are taken into account, however, and final indices adjusted, different relationships may emerge.

---

* This study has now been completed and is reported on pp. 13-16.

(continued)

II. Career Graduates

In another study carried out by the Board of Higher Education in the Spring and Summer of 1968, all community college career students graduating in June 1965 were surveyed via a mailed questionnaire. One hundred twenty-four students from Bronx Community College were mailed questionnaires in May. The follow-up mailing occurred in July. Thirty-four responses were received, or 28%. Three areas of interest were explored:

A) Immediate Post Graduate Employment-Education (Table VI)

B) Educational Plans Over the Next Five Years (Table VII)

C) Employment, Salary and Relevancy to Training (Table VIII)

TABLE VI

Immediate Post Graduate Employment-Education of 34 Bronx Community College "Career" Graduates	
Armed Forces	0
Four-Year College	10½*
Job - Related to Community College Training	20
Job - Sought by Graduate but not Related to Community College Training	2½*
Job - Not Related to Community College Training but Accepted Because of Failure to Find Related Job	0
Other	1

* "½" results from respondees checking more than one option.

Table VI reveals that none of the respondees reported difficulty in placing himself either in a relevant job, or in a four-year college. The proportion of the sample continuing in a college program after graduation from a career program may reveal a tendency for more career students to strive for more formal education and training than they can receive at a community college. This observation receives support in the data shown in Table VII.

(continued)

TABLE VII

Educational Plans Over the Next Five Years	
No Future Schooling	8
Acquisition of Bachelor's Degree	12½
College, as Non-Matric	3
Vocational Training	0
Graduate Degree	9½
Other	0

* "½" results from respondees checking more than one option.

Only eight out of 33 respondees report no plans for further education or training over the five-year period projected. Substantial proportions indicate plans to work toward the bachelor's and higher degrees.

Tables VI and VII must be interpreted in the light of the relatively small sample of respondees and the possibility that the sample is probably selective and biased.

(continued)

TABLE VIII

Employment Areas and Reported Salaries		
Employment Area	No.	Mean Salary Reported
Accounting	7	$8,769
Business	2	4,888
Marketing	1	8,000
Secretarial	3	5,240
Chemical Technology	2	7,100
Electrical Technology	1	4,800
Medical Lab Technology	2	5,000
Nursing	14	7,625

Again, the small number of responses in each category and the highly selected (and therefore biased) nature of the sample, precludes generalizations or inferences from these data.

NE:rsr
1/69

III. A Covariance Analysis of Differences in End of Senior Year Scholastic Indices Between Bronx Community College Students and "Native" Four-Year College Students.

Earlier in this report (pages 7-9), a comparison was made between the scholastic index of Bronx Community College students who completed their junior and senior years at C.C.N.Y. or Hunter (Bronx), and "native" C.C.N.Y. and Hunter students. All students entered their respective schools in the Fall of 1963 as freshmen. In the Fall of 1965, the Bronx Community College graduates entered the junior class at either C.C.N.Y. or Hunter. The sample of C.C.N.Y. and Hunter students were randomly selected from a population of students entering their respective colleges with high school grade averages below 85%. Ninety-seven percent of the students were enrolled in the Liberal Arts Program.

The criterion scores were scholastic indices for the two final years at C.C.N.Y. and Hunter, ending in June 1967. In the earlier analysis it was found that the C.C.N.Y. "natives" earned a higher final two-year index than the Bronx Community College transfers, by .17 of an index point, whereas there was only a .01 of an index point difference at Hunter. No conclusions were drawn because of the possibility of the inequality in the high school averages of the students who entered the three different colleges as freshmen. Significant differences in high school grades, if not taken into consideration, could cloud the interpretation of any similarity or difference in criterion scores (final two-year index).

For this reason an analysis of covariance was performed separately for the students at C.C.N.Y. and Hunter. This procedure adjusted the indices to take into account initial differences in high school grade average so that the difference between the adjusted means could then be analyzed for statistical interperetation. Tables IX and X give the summary statistics for the covariance. The very slight differences between these data and those in Table V may be explained by the fact that a (very) few students had to be eliminated from the study because of unavailability of complete data for them.

(continued)

TABLE IX

Covariance Statistics for Hunter (Bronx)			
	H.S.G.A.	Mean Uncorrected Index	Mean Corrected Index
Bronx C.C.	79.93	2.64	2.66
Native (Hunter)	81.00	2.63	2.61
	Residual Sums-Sq.	Degrees of Freedom Residuals	Variance of Residuals
Between Groups	.0369	1	.0369
Within Groups	9.1120	69	.1320
Total	9.1480	70	F = .28 r = .245

Table IX shows that at Hunter, there is no significant difference in index scores between the Bronx Community College and "native" Hunter students, even after initial high school grade average differences are taken into account. This is not unexpected in view of the very slight initial difference on the control variable. A correlation of .245 between high school grade average and final two-year college scholastic index was computed. Although not central to this analysis, it is seen that high school average is not a good predictor (in itself) of the last two-year college scholastic index. The curtailed range of both variables no doubt contributes to this.

(continued)

TABLE X

Covariance Statistics for C.C.N.Y.			
	H.S.G.A.	Mean Uncorrected Index	Mean Corrected Index
Bronx C.C.	77.92	2.31	2.35
Native (C.C.N.Y.)	83.60	2.58	2.52
	Residual Sums-Sq.	Degrees of Freedom Residuals	Variance of Residuals
Between Groups	.5417	1	.5417
Within Groups	26.9950	121	.2230
Total	27.5368	122	F = 2.43 r = .272 Pr (F = 2.43)> .05

In the case of C.C.N.Y., it is seen (Table X) that there is a difference of 5.7 high school average percentage points between the C.C.N.Y. and Bronx Community College groups, in favor of the former. The uncorrected difference in scholastic index of the last two years at C.C.N.Y. is 2.58 (C.C.N.Y.) - 2.31 (Bronx) = .27 of an index point. The difference between the corrected or adjusted mean indices is 2.52 (C.C.N.Y.) - 2.35 (Bronx) = .17 of an index point. Although this difference is also in favor of the C.C.N.Y. group, the F value of 2.428 indicates that this difference is too small to attribute to a systematic factor. For all practical purposes, therefore, one can say <u>that when initial differences in high school average are taken into account</u>, Bronx Community College transfer students in the Liberal Arts Program at C.C.N.Y. earn the same final two-year scholastic indices as students who directly enter C.C.N.Y. as freshmen.

(continued)

This is not to say that Bronx Community College students earn the same indices as "native" C.C.N.Y. students. C.C.N.Y. students enter college with higher averages, in general, and earn higher final two-year indices. This analysis merely suggests that Bronx Community College students entering Bronx Community College with the same high school average as entering C.C.N.Y. students, would be expected to earn about the same final two-year indices as these "native" C.C.N.Y. students. This is even clearer in the case of Hunter (Bronx).

NE:rsr
1/69

APPENDIX A

Detailed Analysis of Credit Loss for Fifty-Two Bronx Community College Students Upon Transfer to Five Four-Year City Colleges

Transfer to Brooklyn College

-1 x 1 = 1
-2 x 1 = 2 — Both students lost credit because of "Fundamentals of Accounting," for which Bronx Community College gives 4 credits per semester while Brooklyn give 3 transfer credits.

Transfer to C.C.N.Y.

- ½ x 4 = 2 — Four students have apparently lost transfer credit for "Coed Activities." This may have been the practice of one person at the time these students' records were being evaluated. The Bronx Community College catalogue of 1962-64 does not indicate how much credit is given for this course.

- 1 x 6 = 6 — Six students lost one credit each because no transfer credit is given for "Choral Performance" until at least two semesters are completed. This rule applies to the native students as well as transferees.

- 3 x 5 = 15 — Five students lost three credits each because "Intermediate Algebra," SM02, is a high school level course.

- 3 x 1 = 3 — One student lost three credits because "Elementary Algebra," SM01, is a high school level course.

- 3 x 1 = 3 — One student lost three credits because "Trigonometry" was possibly not honored for credit at that time. It is honored now,however.

- 3 x 4 = 12 — Four students lost three credits each because"Introductory College Math," SMB1, is regarded as a high school level course.

- 4 x 5 = 20 — Five students lost four credits each because they completed only one semester of an introductory foreign language course. This rule was changed in Fall 1967, so that all students now receive full credit for the first semester regardless of whether or not they satisfactorily completed the second semester.

- 4 x 1 = 4 — One student lost four credits because he took "Elementary Spanish 1" at Bronx Community College although he had had two years of high school Spanish.

- 3 x 2 = 6 — Two students lost three credits each because no transfer credit is given for "Physics 1 Technology."

- 4 x 1 = 4 — One student lost four credits because of a course, "Textiles." This was not regarded as a liberal arts course, but if the student had appealed, he might have received credit for it.

Transfer to Hunter (Bronx)

- 3 x 2 = 6 Two students lost three credits each because no credit it given for "Survey of Math 1" which is regarded as a repeat of high school level mathematics.

- 3 x 2 = 6 Two students lost 3 credits each because no transfer credit is given for "Business Mathematics."

- 4 x 1 = 4 One student lost four credits because no transfer credit was given for "Principles of Science," which was a non lab course at the time.

- 4 x 4 = 16 Four students lost four transfer credits each because the first language class they took at Bronx Community College was regarded as repetition of high school work.

- 4 x 1 = 4 One student lost four transfer credits because an additional semester foreign language was an entrance condition at Hunter (Bronx).

- 4 x 1 = 4 One student lost four transfer credits because "Fundamentals of Accounting 1" would not be honored for credit unless the student completed a second semester of Accounting.

- 8 x 1 = 8 The student lost 4 credits because his 14 points of analytic geometry and calculus courses were honored for only 10 transfer credits, the number of credits given for equivalent courses at Hunter (Bronx). The student lost 4 more credits because Engineering Physics 2 is not honored for credit.

Transfer to Hunter (Park Avenue)

- 4 x 1 = 4 The student lost 4 credits because College Spanish 1 was regarded as a repeat of high school work. The student had taken 3 years of high school Spanish.

Transfer to Queens College

- 4 x 1 = 4 The student lost four credits because he had taken 16 credits of German at Bronx Community College of which only 12 were honored for transfer credit by Queens College. The department chairman considered that "Elementary German" 1 and 2 (German 01 and 02) at Bronx Community College are equivalent to only one semester of college level German.

ME:rsr
1/69